UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,707	02/26/2002	Gregory G. Brucker	1001.2256101	1518
	7590 01/11/201 SEAGER & TUFTE, L	EXAMINER		
1221 NICOLLET AVENUE			TYSON, MELANIE RUANO	
SUITE 800 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3773	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/11/2010	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/083,707	BRUCKER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

MELANIE TYSON 3773	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	-
THE REPLY FILED 18 December 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonr application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following to periods:	places the Request
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whicheve no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> <li>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED V MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</li> </ul>	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension so the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office active set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension fee on; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the app Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS	
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered becaus  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issappeal; and/or	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment car</li> </ul>	
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explan	
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is nece was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will no entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to p showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
<ul> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance be See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)</li> </ul>	ecause:
13. Other:	
/(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773  /Melanie Tyson/ Examiner, Art Unit 3773	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments are not persuasive. The applicant argues that any portion of Marotta's balloon which so happens to be aligned with the moveable member is clearly not a "predetermined" region of the balloon. However, it is the examiner's position that Marotta's bulge region may be considered "predetermined" in that it is "predetermined" that the location of the portion aligned with the movable member will form a bulge region. Therefore, it is the examiner's position that Marotta teaches a predetermined bulge region at a predetermined location as recited in the claims. The applicant's arguments with respect to Vardi and Crocker are moot since Marotta discloses a predetermined bulge region at a predetermined location as recited in the claims.